

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03667 092043Z

54

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 USIE-00 CIAE-00 PM-03 INR-07 L-03

ACDA-05 NSAE-00 PA-01 PRS-01 SP-02 TRSE-00 SAJ-01

SS-15 NSC-05 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00 /056 W

----- 117574

O R 091940Z JUL 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2643

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USCINCEUR

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T USNATO 3667

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: FRG COMMENTS ON US DRAFT OF "ADDITIONAL ASPECTS"

PAPER ON OPTION III

REF: STATE 156821

1. FRG DELEGATION REP HOYNCK CALLED ON MISSION IN LATE AFTERNOON
OF JULY 9 TO PRESENT GERMAN COMMENTS ON THE US DRAFT PAPER (TEXT
IN REFTEL) WHICH WAS GIVEN TO THEM AT JULY 4 TRILATERAL. HOYNCK
SAID THAT THESE COMMENTS WERE ALSO BEING TRANSMITTED TO GERMAN
EMBASSY LONDON TO BE GIVEN TO THE UK AND TO GERMAN MBFR DELEGATION
IN VIENNA TO BE GIVEN TO AMBASSADOR RESOR. GERMAN EMBASSY WASHINGTON
ALSO RECEIVED A COPY FOR THEIR INFORMATION. WHAT FOLLOWS WAS
TRANSLATED BY HOYNCK AS HE WENT ALONG, AND REPRESENTS SUBSTANCE
BUT NOT REPEAT NOT PRECISE TEXT OF GERMAN COMMENTS. HOYNCK EMPHASIZED

THESE COMMENTS ARE NOT FINAL.

2. THE SHAPE ASSESSMENT SHOULD BE COMPARED WITH THE US DRAFT

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03667 092043Z

POSITION PAPER. HOYNCK WAS NOT CLEAR WHAT THIS COMMENT MEANT.

3. PARAGRAPH 3 OF THE US DRAFT, WHICH DESCRIBES THE COMMON
CEILING OBJECTIVE, IS INSUFFICIENTLY PRECISE. MORE DISCUSSION

OF THIS POINT IS NEEDED. THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD CONTAIN A DEFINITION OF WHAT THE PHRASE "APPROPRIATELY DEFINED" IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE MEANS. ON A PERSONAL BASIS, HOYNCK EXPLAINED THAT THIS PARAGRAPH SHOULD SPELL OUT EXACTLY WHAT WE WOULD WANT THE EAST TO AGREE TO. AGAIN PERSONALLY, HE THOUGHT IT MIGHT BE A GOOD IDEA TO STATE BOTH A MAIMUM OBJECTIVE, WHICH PRESUMABLY WOULD BE EASTERN AGREEMENT TO THE LEVEL OF THE COMMON CEILING AS A PRECISE NUMBER, AND THE MINIMUM WHICH THE WEST WOULD ACCEPT IF THE EAST RESISTED SUCH PRECISION. HOYNCK'S OWN IDEA OF SUCH A MINIMUM POSITION WOULD BE EASTERN AGREEMENT TO THE PHRASE "ILLUSTRATIVELY 900,000." HOYNCK BELIEVED THAT THIS WAS AN AREA IN WHICH ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD BE GIVEN SOME FLEXIBILITY. HE EMPHASIZED THAT BONN IS STILL THINKING ABOUT THIS SUBJECT. HE DOES NOT YET HAVE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE "MIGHT/WOULD" QUESTION IN PARAGRAPH 1 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, AND BELIEVES THAT THE GERMAN POSITION ON THIS MAY DEPEND ON WHAT IS IN THE SUPPLEMENTAL PAPER.

4. BETWEEN THE SECTIONS "II" OBJECTIVES" AND "III LIMITATIONS" THERE SHOULD BE A SECTION ON "REDUCTIONS". THIS COULD INCORPORATE MUCH OF THE MATERIAL NOW CONTAINED IN THE "LIMITATIONS" SECTION. IT SHOULD COVER THE THREE ELEMENTS WHICH THE US WOULD REDUCE AND SOVIET TANKS. IN CONFORMITY WITH THE SHAPE ASSESSMENT, IT SHOULD CLARIFY WHAT US WARHEADS SHOULD BE REDUCED. COMMENT: WE BELIEVE THIS REFERS TO THE AMBIGUITY OVER WHETHER WARHEADS "AVAILABLE FOR USE BY US UNITS" COULD INCLUDE WARHEADS FORMERLY ASSOCIATED WITH ALLIED SYSTEMS THAT HAVE BEEN PHASED OUT. END COMMENT,

5. THE PAPER SHOULD CLARIFY THE "STRUCTURE OF THE COMBINED COMMON CEILING." COMMENT: THIS APPARENTLY REFERS TO AIR AND GROUND SUBCEILINGS. END COMMENT, IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO SPEED UP MBFR WORKING GROUP CONSIDERATION OF THIS ISSUE.

6. PARAGRAPH 9 OF THE US DRAFT PRESUPPOSES A THROUGH DISCUSSION OF THE DIFINITIONS ISSUE, WHICH HAS ALREADY STARTED IN THE SPC.

7. PARAGRAPH 10 OF THE US PAPER REQUIRES MORE SUBSTANCE. OUR POSITION ON US TANK LIMITATIONS MUST TAKE "A CONCRETE FORM."

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03667 092043Z

HOYNCK RECALLED THAT AT THE JULY 4 TRILATERAL TICKELL HAD SAID THAT THE UK WAS WILLING TO KEEP THIS AGREEMENT A TRILATERAL ONE TO AVOID LEAKAGE, BUT THAT A PRECISE TRILATERAL AGREEMENT WAS ESSENTIAL.

8. PARAGRAPH 12 OF THE US DRAFT SHOULD REFER TO PARAGRAPH 9 OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE. IT SHOULD MAKE CLEAR THAT NON-CIRCUMVENTION IN BOTH PHASES CAN ONLY LIMIT PERSONNEL, AND NOT EQUIPMENT. COMMENT: THIS APPARENTLY MEANS THAT FRG WANTS ALLIANCE AGREEMENT THAT NON-US NATO ARMAMENTS WOULD NOT BE LIMITED AT ALL, EITHER EXPLICITLY OR IMPLICITLY, AS A RESULT OF EITHER REDUCTION OR NON-CIRCUMVENTION AGREEMENTS IN EITHER PHASE. END COMMENT.

9. THERE SHOULD BE A CLEAR AGREEMENT AMONG THE ALLIES THAT NO FURTHER NUCLEAR ELEMENTS WOULD BE REDUCED IN PHASE II. INDEED, IT SHOULD BE CLEAR THAT THERE WOULD BE NO ADDITIONAL ARMAMENTS IN ALLIED OFFERS IN EITHER PHASE. HOYNCK'S PHRASE WAS "FURTHER EXTENSION OF THE NEGOTIATIONS IS OUT OF THE QUESTION."

10. CLARIFICATION IS NEEDED ON HOW THE ALLIES WOULD DECIDE WHETHER A NEW SOVIET MODEL (HOYNCK WAS UNCLEAR WHETHER THIS MEANT A TANK MODEL, AN AIRCRAFT MODEL, OR BOTH) FALLS INTO OR OUTSIDE OF THE CATEGORY SUBJECT TO LIMITATIONS.

11. FURTHER CLARIFICATION IS NEEDED ON THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE ALLIES MIGHT AGREE TO AIR MANPOWER REDUCTIONS. THE CONDITIONS STATE IN PARAGRAPH 13 OF THE US DRAFT ARE NOT FULLY SATISFACTORY. HOYNCK WAS UNABLE TO STATEWHAT ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS SHOULD BE SET, BUT REFERRED US TO THE MBFR WORKING GROUP PAPER ON THE SUBJECT.

12. THE PHRASE "COLLECTIVE COMMON CEILING" WOULD BETTER CLARIFY ALLIED RESISTANCE TO SUBCEILINGS. ON A PERSONAL BASIS HOYNCK CONSIDERED THIS FRG POINT "UNCONVINCING."

13. WE ASKED HOYNCK HOW HE THOUGHT WE SHOULD PROCEED NOW. HE SIAID HE HAD NO INSTRUCTIONS, BUT PERSONALLY HE THOUGHT THE US MIGHT WISH TO REVISE ITS DRAFT ON THE BASIS OF THESE COMMENTS (AND UK COMMENTS WHEN WE GET THEM) AND THEN DISCUSS THIS REVISED VERSION AT THE NEXT TRILATERAL MEETING. HOYNCK HOPES
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03667 092043Z

THAT WE CAN GET THE PAPER TABLED IN THE SPC SOON. ONE MORE TRILATERAL SHOULD BE ENOUGH FOR MOST IF NOT ALL OF THE PAPER. HOYNCK STATED WITH GREAT EMPHASIS THAT BONN WILL NOT AGREE TO A GUIDANCE TEXT BEFORE THIS FURTHER "POSITION PAPER" IS FINALIZED. BONN IS OPEN TO SUGGESTIONS ON HOW TO PROCEED, BUT HOYNCK HIMSELF WOULD FAVOR TABLING THE ENTIRE TEXT OF THE APER AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. THE SPC COULD THEN ADDRESS ONE SUBJECT AT A TIME, WORKING THE APPROPRIATE SECTIONS OF BOTH THE DRAFT GUIADNCE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL PAPER. THIS WOULD AVOID DISCUSSING EACH ISSUE TWICE, ONCE FOR EACH PAPER.
BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 09 JUL 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO03667
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrzkye.tel
Line Count: 153
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: STATE 156821
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by Izenbel0>; APPROVED <07 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: FRG COMMENTS ON US DRAFT OF "ADDITIONAL ASPECTS" PAPER ON OPTION III
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USCINCEUR
USNMR SHAPE

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006